

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: James Clough et al.

Serial No.: 10/076,175

Filed: February 13, 2002

Docket No.: 10015194-1

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR AUTHORIZING PRINTING

REMARKS

The following Remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 17, 2006, in which claims 1-10 and 15-29 were rejected, and claims 11-14 were objected to. With this Amendment, claims 10 and 17-21 have been cancelled without prejudice, claims 30-33 have been added, and claims 1, 11-16, 22, and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-9, 11-16, and 22-33, therefore, remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jeyachandran et al. US Patent No. 6,567,176.

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tan et al. US Patent No. 5,978,560.

With this Amendment, claims 10 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice. The rejection of claims 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), therefore, is rendered moot.

With this Amendment, claims 20 and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice. The rejection of claims 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), therefore, is rendered moot.

With this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the method includes receiving a print job identifying a print destination; determining a printing policy of the print job; with the printing policy being based on the first location associated with the source of the print job and the second location associated with the print destination; and communicating the print job to the print destination if the print job satisfies the printing policy.

With this Amendment, independent claim 22 has been amended to clarify that the server receives a print job identifying a print destination and determines a first location associated with a source of the print job and a second location associated with the print destination, wherein the at least one printing policy is based on the source of the print job and the print destination, and wherein the print job is communicated to the print destination if the print job satisfies the at least one printing policy.

With this Amendment, independent claim 26 has been amended to clarify that the one or more processors receive a print job identifying a print destination; determine a printing

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Amendment and Response

Applicant: James Clough et al.

Serial No.: 10/076,175

Filed: February 13, 2002

Docket No.: 10015194-1

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR AUTHORIZING PRINTING

policy of the print job, with the printing policy being based on the first location associated with the source of the print job and the second location associated with the print destination; and communicate the print job to the print destination if the print job satisfies the printing policy.

With respect to the Jeyachandran et al. patent, Applicant submits that this patent does not teach or suggest a method as claimed in independent claim 1, a server as claimed in independent claim 22, nor computer-readable media as claimed in independent claim 26.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 22, and 26 are each patentably distinct from the Jeyachandran et al. patent and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. Furthermore, as dependent claims 2-9 further define patentably distinct claim 1, dependent claims 23-25 further define patentably distinct claim 22, and dependent claims 27-29 further define patentably distinct claim 26, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15-17, 19, 22, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that claims 1-9, 22-25, and 26-29 be allowed.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 18, 23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeyachandran et al. in view of Lodwick US Patent No. 6,978,299.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 24, 25, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeyachandran et al. in view of Yacoub US Patent No. 6,552,813.

As outlined above, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 22, and 26 are each patentably distinct from the Jeyachandran et al. patent and, therefore, are each in a condition for allowance. As dependent claims 2-9 further define patentably distinct claim 1, dependent claims 23-25 further define patentably distinct claim 22, and dependent claims 27-29 further define patentably distinct claim 26, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also in a condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 2, 18, 23, and 27 and claims 3, 4, 7, 24, 25, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that dependent claims 2-9, 23-25, and 27-29 be allowed.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Amendment and Response

Applicant: James Clough et al.

Serial No.: 10/076,175

Filed: February 13, 2002

Docket No.: 10015194-1

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR AUTHORIZING PRINTING

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

With this Amendment, Applicant has rewritten allowable claim 11 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 10) and any intervening claims (none). Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 13-16 to depend directly or indirectly from rewritten independent claim 11. As rewritten claim 11 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 13-16 are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claim 11 be withdrawn and that claims 11 and 13-16 be allowed.

With this Amendment, Applicant has rewritten allowable claim 12 in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim (claim 10) and any intervening claims (none). In addition, Applicant has added new claims 30-33 to depend directly or indirectly from rewritten independent claim 12. As rewritten claim 12 is now believed to be in allowable form, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 30-33 are allowable in dependent form. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn and that claims 12 and 30-33 be allowed.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Amendment and Response

Applicant: James Clough et al.

Serial No.: 10/076,175

Filed: February 13, 2002

Docket No.: 10015194-1

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR AUTHORIZING PRINTING

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-9, 11-16, and 22-33 are all in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Nathan Rieth at Telephone No. (208) 396-5287, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Scott A. Lund at Telephone No. (612) 573-2006, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:


Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

James Clough et al.,

By,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250
100 South Fifth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 573-2006
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: JUNE 19, 2006
SAL:hsf
Scott A. Lund
Reg. No. 41,166

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on this 10TH day of June, 2006.

By 
Name: Scott A. Lund